



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/190,788	11/12/1998	CHRISTOPHER N. MACROGLOU	97-019-DIV	7074

7590 06/18/2003

HENRY E BARTONY JR  
BARTONY HARE & EDSON  
429 FOURTH AVENUE SUITE 1801  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

GORDON, RAEANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3711

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EC

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/190,788	MACROGLOU, CHRISTOPHER N
Examiner	Art Unit	
Raeann Gorden	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 13-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 13-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 22-26 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harkness in view of Carney. Harkness discloses a device support member worn around a person's head and an attached laser light (abstract) generating a linear alignment beam of light visible to the person to provide an alignment of the person's body when in position to perform the task as stated in claims 1 and 2 (figs. 2 and 3). Harkness also discloses a cylindrical lens and positions the lens to direct the beam of light as in claim 2 (fig 4 and col 3, lines 20-26). Regarding claims 19 and 20, Harkness does not disclose the device around the chest or hips of the user. Harkness does disclose the device as being interchangeable among different items. However, moving the device from one body part to another is a method of use, which is not relevant to the structure of the device. Harkness discloses a spot of light on the ground and does not disclose a line of light. However, Carney teaches a line of light alignment. One skilled in the art would have modified the invention of Harkness with Carney by changing the spot of light to a line of light to provide a more accurate alignment means for the user.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 22-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 5-16-03 have been considered but they are not fully persuasive. Applicant argues the Harkness reference does not disclose the claimed invention. Harkness discloses a device comprising a support member worn on a person's head and a light source comprising a laser. Harkness further discloses a spot on the ground produced by the laser beam but does not disclose a line of light. Carney teaches a line of light produced by a laser beam. Applicant further argues the Harkness reference is used to prevent movement and the present invention is used to achieve the proper alignment. However, the method of using the device is not relevant to apparatus. The structural limitations as claimed are disclosed by Harkness in view of Carney. Applicant also argues one would not modify the line a spot of light with a line of light. The Examiner disagrees. As shown in the rejection above, Harkness teaches the structural limitations claimed by applicant, except for the line of light produced by the laser. Harkness discloses a spot of light and the secondary reference, Carney, teaches a golfing device with a line of light. Since both references disclose golfing devices it is not clear why applicant would argue the present disclosure is used to reconstruct

Art Unit: 3711

applicant's invention. Clearly, the present invention is not the first in the golfing industry to include a line of light as taught by Carney.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 703-308-8354. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Sewell can be reached on 703-308-2126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



Raeann Gorden  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3711

rg  
June 16, 2003